



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,509	09/08/2003	Kazuaki Nakamura	KON-1818	9322
20311	7590	09/20/2005	EXAMINER	
LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP 475 PARK AVENUE SOUTH 15TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10016			CHEA, THORL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1752	

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/657,509

Applicant(s)

NAKAMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Thorl Chea

Art Unit

1752

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: None.
Claim(s) objected to: None.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-18.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Thorl Chea
Thorl Chea
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1752

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the changing of the dependency of 2 to 9 under claim 15 further limit the scope of the compound of formula (1) of claim 15 change the scope of the claims and therefore such limitation require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: because of the reason set forth in the Final Office action. The Examiner's position with respect to the Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 on March 23, 2005 is not changed for the reason set forth in the Final Office Action. The results shown in the Declaration is also insufficient to determine the unexpected results of the claimed invention in view of the applied prior art. The results shown in Table 4 of the Declaration is related to the material made according to Fukui but this material is processed according to Oya. Therefore, it is impossible to determine the results shown therein in view of the results shown in Fukui et al. The argument with respect to the difference between value of fog due to the different manners of evaluation is based on the Counsel's assertion, and Counsel's arguments cannot take the place of evidence. In re Greenfield, 571 F. 2d 1185, 197 USPQ 227 (CCPA 1978). There is no statement in the Declaration stated that the material of the results shown in the Declaration would have been unexpected to the worker of ordinary skill in the art eventough its fog value found to be higher than that disclosed in Fukui et al. The results shown in the Declaration are also confusing. See Tables 4-5, under the column of Dmax. These values appear to be related to the sensitivity rather than the value of Dmax. The Dmax value cannot be determined. There is no comparison between the color tone disclosed in Fukui et al and that of the claimed invention. The Declaration is not commensurate with the scope of the claimed invention. See the scope of the compound of formula (1) and (3) in claim 15 for instance. The scope of the compound encompasses an indefinite number of substituents disclosed in Fukui et al of formula (III) in claim 11 while only a single compound of formula 2-3 is used therein. No Terminal Disclaimer has been submitted. Therefore, the rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting is maintained.